

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-22, 32-38, 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sirringhaus et al. (WO 01/46987). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner's analysis of Sirringhaus and its application to the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants incorporate their arguments in their July 31, 2009 Amendment.

Second, Applicants provide the following additional comments. In the "Response to Arguments" section at pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action, it appears that the Examiner is of the understanding that Applicants have simply been arguing that Sirringhaus does not disclose using a surface energy pattern to localize electrically conductive material for forming source and drain electrodes of a transistor device. However, Sirringhaus does not disclose using the surface energy pattern employed to localize conductive material (2 and 3 in cited Figure 7c of WO01/46987) and to also localize semiconductive material and form an island of semiconductive material. The Examiner has not made any mention in the "Response to Arguments" section of this feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, at the rejection of claim 1 at pages 2-3 of the office action, the Examiner has failed to indicate where he considers that Sirringhaus discloses using the surface energy pattern employed to localize the electrically conductive material (2 and 3 in cited Figure 7c of WO01/46987) to also localize semiconductive material (4 in Figure 7c) deposited over the electrically conductive material. The Examiner has made specific reference to Figure 7(c) of WO01/46987, however, this figure does not teach using the surface energy pattern employed to localize the electrically conductive material (2 and 3 in cited Figure 7c of WO01/46987) and to also localize semiconductive material 4 in Figure 7c. Figure 7(c) was not intended to be an illustration of such a technique, and the written description of Figure 7(c) at pages 22 to 28 does not include any mention of such a technique.

On the other hand, pages 10-14 of the specification provides technical teachings as to how to modify the kind of technique described in Sirringhaus so as to use the surface energy pattern employed to localise the electrically conductive material (2 and 3 in cited Figure 7c of Sirringhaus) to also localize semiconductive material 4 in Figure 7c. Said technical teaching is not included, nor suggested in Sirringhaus.

Claims 2-10, 12-19, 21-22, 32-38, 44-51 should be allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1 for the reasons given above and for the reasons contained in the July 31, 2009 Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 20, 23-25, 30, 31 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirringhaus. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

These claims should be allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1 for the reasons given above and for the reasons contained in the July 31, 2009 Amendment.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Carl J. Pellegrini cjp / 40,766
Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 13, 2009